

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

Robert Garcia,

Plaintiff,

v.

Pentagroup Financial, LLC,

Defendant.

:
:
: Civil Action No.: _____
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

COMPLAINT

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Robert Garcia, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of the Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of the Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendant and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.

2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Robert Garcia ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Mabank, Texas, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. Defendant Pentagroup Financial, LLC (“PentaGroup”), is a Texas business entity with an address of 5959 Corporate Drive, Suite 1400, Houston, Texas 77036, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

6. The Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the “Debt”) to Kia Motor Finance (the “Creditor”).

7. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

8. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to PentaGroup for collection, or PentaGroup was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

9. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. PentaGroup Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

10. On January 13, 2011, Defendants called Plaintiff’s father-in-law and falsely stated that there was a “matter being filed” against Plaintiff. Defendants also stated, “Robert needs to call me concerning his legal rights.” Plaintiff has not been served, nor is he aware of any lawsuit being filed.

11. Plaintiff called Defendants back the same day. Defendants failed to identify themselves to Plaintiff and Plaintiff mistakenly assumed he was talking to Creditor. Defendants also failed to inform Plaintiff that the call was an attempt to collect the debt and everything

Plaintiff said would be used for that purpose. Defendants threatened Plaintiff with a lawsuit. To date, no such lawsuit has been filed.

12. Defendants offered Plaintiff to settle the Debt for 60 % of the total debt amount. Believing he was dealing with the original creditor, Plaintiff agreed and gave Defendants his debit card account number for withdrawal purposes. Plaintiff requested that Defendant send him a written correspondence with the terms of the settlement offer by January 22, 2011. Defendants failed to do so.

13. On January 26, 2011, Plaintiff called Defendants and requested that they suspend withdrawal. Ryan, an individual collector for Defendant, asked, "What are you doing? Are you planning a vacation? Is that why you can't pay your debt?" Plaintiff stated, "It's not your business." Ryan disconnected the call.

14. Plaintiff called back repeatedly trying to resolve the matter. However, Defendants kept disconnecting calls.

15. Defendants failed to inform Plaintiff of his rights under the state and federal laws by written correspondence within 5 days after the initial communication, including the right to dispute the Debt.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

16. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

17. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

18. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

19. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(1) in that Defendants contacted third parties and failed to identify themselves and further failed to confirm or correct location information.

20. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b) in that Defendants communicated with individuals other than the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff's attorney, or a credit bureau.

21. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6) in that Defendants placed calls to the Plaintiff without disclosing the identity of the debt collection agency.

22. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5) in that Defendants threatened to take legal action, without actually intending to do so.

23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11) in that Defendants failed to inform the consumer that the communication was an attempt to collect a debt.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the amount of the Debt.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(2) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the name of the original creditor to whom the Debt was owed.

27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(3) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the Plaintiff's right to dispute the Debt within thirty days.

28. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(4) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice informing the Plaintiff of a right to have verification and judgment mailed to the Plaintiff.

29. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(5) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice containing the name and address of the original creditor.

30. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

31. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

COUNT II
VIOLATIONS OF THE TEXAS DEBT COLLECTION ACT
TEX. FIN. CODE ANN. § 392, et al.

32. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

33. The Plaintiff is a "consumer" as defined by Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.001(1).

34. The Defendants are each a "debt collector" and a "third party debt collector" as defined by Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.001(6) and (7).

35. The Defendants called the Plaintiff and failed to identify the name of the debt collection agency or the individual debt collector, with the intent to annoy and harass, in violation of Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.302(2).

36. The Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief and actual damages pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403(a)(1) and (2) and to remedies under Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code § 17.62 pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.404(a).

COUNT III
INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION INTO PRIVATE AFFAIRS

37. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

38. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, “One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.”

39. Texas further recognizes the Plaintiff’s right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus the Defendants violated Texas state law.

40. The Defendants intentionally intruded upon the Plaintiff’s right to privacy by calling Plaintiff’s father-in-law with regard to Plaintiff’s debt and telling his father-in-law that there was a matter being filed against Plaintiff.

41. The conduct of the Defendants in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

42. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendants.

43. All acts of the Defendants and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, the Defendants are subject to punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the

Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for each violation pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against the Defendants;
4. Injunctive relief pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403(a)(1);
5. Actual damages pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403(a)(2);
6. Remedies under Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code § 17.62 pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.404(a);
7. Actual damages from the Defendants for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
8. Punitive damages; and
9. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: April 25, 2011

Respectfully submitted,
By: /s/ Diana P. Larson
Diana P. Larson

Texas Bar No. 24007799
Erik V. Larson
Texas Bar No. 00791076
The Larson Law Office, PLLC
14785 Preston Road, Suite 550
Dallas, Texas 75154
Telephone: (877) 775-3666 x.5504
Facsimile: (888) 953-6237
Email: diana@thelarsonlawoffice.com
Email: erik@thelarsonlawoffice.com

Of Counsel To:
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
A Connecticut Law Firm
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (888) 953-6237
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF